

**REMARKS**

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16 and 18 are pending. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 16, and 18 have been allowed. By this response claim 12 is amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) as being anticipated by Nishino Kenji (JP Patent No. 06-12195). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that, Kenji fails to teach varying a frequency characteristic of the image signal by controlling current passing through a secondary winding to vary an inductance value of said primary winding in a periodic manner and inputting the image signal with said frequency characteristic having been varied in said periodic manner to a cathode ray tube, as recited in claim 12.

It is alleged in the Office Action that paragraph [0031] as recited in Nishino Kenji provides support for inputting a signal in which the previous characteristic has already varied in a periodic manner to a cathode ray tube. Applicant strongly disagrees.

First, it is noted that a temporal spatial shift of a signal is not a change in frequency characteristic. Paragraph [0033] states:

“Police box current is a coil L1 and L2. If it flows through a series circuit, vertical alternating field the current coloring neck of a cathode ray 2 section. The three primary color (red, green, blue) electron beams of a level in-line arrangement, it is slightly shaken at a longitudinal direction and the moiré by the level spatial-frequency component is reduced by what the display position of the color video signal supplied to a color cathode ray tube is slightly shifted by right and left for every line.”

Upon dissecting this sentence, it is clear that the moiré is reduced by the spatial frequency component the same amounts “by” what the display position is shifted.

The exact language refers to the moiré being reduced by what the position of the color video signal supplied to the cathode ray tube is shifted. Therefore, the image is shifted prior to being supplied to the cathode ray tube but no frequency characteristics are changed.

The first sentence of paragraph [0033] refers to the vertical alternating field occurring in the color neck of the cathode ray tube section and then the second sentence discusses the various primary colors in reduction of the moiré. The reduction of the moiré occurs in the cathode ray tube where the reduction is the same amount as the temporal image shift which occurs prior to the cathode ray tube. Thus, there is no teaching of the frequency characteristic change prior to the cathode ray tube only a temporal image shift.

Second, the Examiner completely misinterprets the term “periodic.” The examiner refers to circuit a 10 which generates an alternating voltage, asserting a wave as teaching the frequency

characteristic being varied by controlling the current passing through secondary winding to vary the inductance of the primary winding in the periodic manner and also the frequency characteristic having been varied in the periodic manner. Applicant's reference to "periodic manner" does not refer to the periodic cycle of a signal but instead refers to an alternative means of periodic which refers to "regular intervals" which is not associated with the standard meaning of a period within a signal. Thus, the frequency characteristic which is an element of the frequency is changed at regular intervals. This has nothing to do with an alternating voltage which is a repeated voltage signal. There is no change to the frequency component at regular intervals by the alternating voltage generator 10 of Nishino Kenji. This understanding of this terminology has previously been discussed in prior responses. This understanding can also be gleaned from the Specification. The Applicant reminds the Examiner that an interpretation of the particular language of the claim, specifically it carries more than one standard meaning for the claim term, should come from the Specification and not based on the Examiner's own interpretation.

Thus, it is not understood why the message generating circuit 10 continues to be a prior to teaching the "periodic" variant of the frequency characteristic and further the periodic variant of an inductive value in the secondary winding as recited in claim 12. How does the voltage generating circuit refer to the variant of an inductive value in a particular coil in a periodic manner? There is no correlation and thus there is no teaching of these particular claimed elements.

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12-15 are distinguished from the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

**CONCLUSION**

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application; the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

  
By   
D. Richard Anderson  
Registration No.: 40,439  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant